



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1850
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/660,110

09/12/2000

Thomas P. Hardjono

2204/A45

6748

34845

7590

11/07/2005

STEUBING AND MCGUINNESS & MANARAS LLP
125 NAGOG PARK
ACTON, MA 01720

EXAMINER

CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2145

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/660,110	Applicant(s) HARDJONO ET AL.	
	Examiner Azizul Choudhury	Art Unit 2145	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Azizul Choudhury.

(3) Jefferey Swearingen.

(2) Patrice Winder.

(4) David A. Dagg.

Date of Interview: 01 November 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: Agenda.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Aggarwal et al (US Pat No: 6154463).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


JASON CARBONS
SPE AU2145

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative expressed his concern over the Aggarwal prior art and which portion taught the claimed access device. Examiner Choudhury explained how the Gatekeeper router of the Aggarwal design is equivalent to the claimed access device. Applicant's representative then explained how his client's design allows the subscriber device to be in an essence, "substituted" by the access device. Primary examiner Winder then explained that the claim language did not illustrate such a feature and made recommendations as to how to proceed with regards to possible amendments. No agreements have been reached.

DAVID A. DAGG
STEUBING MCGUINNESS & MANARAS LLP
125 NAGOG PARK DRIVE
ACTON MA 01720
617.630.1131

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	FROM:
Examiner Azizul Choudhury	David A. Dagg
COMPANY:	DATE:
USPTO	10/14/2005
FAX NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
571.273.3909	2
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
	120-348
RE:	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER:
Proposed Agenda	09/660,110

☐ URGENT ☐ FOR REVIEW ☐ PLEASE COMMENT ☒ PLEASE REPLY ☐ PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

Dear Examiner Choudhury:

Transmitted herewith is a proposed Interview Agenda for discussion of the above U.S. patent application. Please call me at 617.630.1131 or send me email at ddagg@smmalaw.com.

Thanks,

Dave D.

AGENDA FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW
REGARDING U.S. PATENT APPLICATION
09/660,110

I. Objective - Identify possible amendments to further distinguish claimed invention over the cited references, specifically with respect to Aggarwal et al. and the Examiner's comments in the Office Action.

II. Example claim features to discuss and possibly clarify:

i) "wherein each said access device acts to *join and leave at least one multicast group on behalf of the subscriber devices at its respective subscriber location*",

ii) "wherein each said access device processes a join request from one of said subscriber devices by determining whether said access device is already joined to a multicast group indicated by said join request, and, *in the event that said access device is not already joined to said multicast group indicated by said join request, sending a join request to said multicast distribution device.*"

The above feature examples are from independent claim 1.

III. Example aspects of Aggarwal et al. to be discussed (see column 22):

i) Aggarwal et al. teaches that a gatekeeper router maintains routes to group members

ii) Aggarwal et al. teaches that all group members passing through the gatekeeper router are each individual members of the group

iii) Aggarwal et al. teaches that the gatekeeper router can operate as a filter for join requests, in that it can accept or reject them.

IV) Discussion - Applicants respectfully believe that the teachings of Aggarwal et al. do not suggest a single access device joining a multicast group member on behalf of multiple subscriber devices, such that *the subscriber devices themselves do not join the multicast group*. In the present invention, the group membership is only changed to include the access device, no matter how many subscriber devices issue join requests. That is not the case in Aggarwal et al., or in join operations joining multiple nodes at once, as are also mentioned in the Office Action. This distinction seems to be in the claims as the presently stand, but could possibly be clarified by amendment.